

---

**Decision Session  
Cabinet Member for Transport**

**26<sup>th</sup> March 2015**

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

**Petition – Heslington Lane, Heslington Ward and Fulford Ward**

**Summary**

1. The purpose of this report is to consider a 534 signature petition (Annex A copy of front page of petition) requesting City of York Council take action to prevent parking on Heslington Lane due to a recent increase in on street parking.

**Recommendations**

2. The Cabinet Member is asked to approve:

Item 1 - Option C - Taking forward proposals funded by the University.

Reason: because this is in line with the well established policy for dealing with requests for new waiting restrictions (that is; part of the annual review or, as in this case independently funded).

Timescale: Resources are already committed for this financial year consequently the investigation has been added to the forward work schedule beginning in April 2015. It is anticipated that a scheme would be brought forward to an Officer in Consultation meeting for approval to advertise early in the new financial year.

The Cabinet Member is also asked to note:

The ongoing surveys carried out by the University that will inform any further necessary interventions as results become available.

## **Background**

3. In October 2014 the council were alerted to the fact that vehicles had started to be parked on Heslington Lane in an area where previously little parking regularly took place. This change to the environment of the road lead some residents, road users and users of the local golf club to raise concerns that a collision may take place between opposing follows of vehicles. Regular monitoring of the situation showed that some vehicles were being parking part on the footway causing a reduction in width for users. Vehicles parked wholly on the carriageway of the road at this time allowed for 2 vehicles to pass along side the parked vehicles. Due to funding in the 2014/15 year being already committed the area was added to the next review of waiting restriction to take place in the new financial year 2015/16. In the interim period the area has been monitored. The amount of vehicles being parked has steadily increased but on the whole 2 way traffic flow by most vehicles is still possible. Heslington Lane falls into one of the areas where displaced parking is surveyed that may be attributed to the University campus development. The survey for this area by the Universities consultant is programmed to be taking place in March 2015 with the second survey in November 2015. These surveys would require a 20% increase in parking that can be attributed to the University above the base line figures of 2009 to trigger action funded by the University.
4. The cost of taking forward individual items to prohibit parking is prohibitively high at around £1k to £1.5k due to the press advertising costs. When tackled in batches however, the cost drops to around £150 per item, hence it is current policy to deal with requests for waiting restrictions on an annual basis and the savings amount to somewhere in the region of £50k per year.

## **Consultation**

5. A scheme outlining the lengths of any proposed waiting restrictions would be presented at an officer in consultation meeting with the Interim Director of City and Environmental Services and the Cabinet Member for Transport. Permission would be requested to formally advertise the restrictions though the legal process.
6. During the legal advertising period objections to the proposals could be made for consideration at a further meeting.

## Options

7. The options available are:

- Item 1

Carry out an investigation to develop a minimal set of waiting restriction proposals for Heslington Lane to ease the problems for large vehicles passing through the area without causing a displacement of parking in to nearby residential areas.

A. Add this to the next annual review due to begin in the autumn. This is not the recommended option owing to the level of concern expressed locally and public transport reliability concerns.

B. Take forward the above proposals as an individual item. This is not the recommended option for the reasons outlined above.

C. Take forward a set of proposals out of turn provided funds are made available from the University (this is in the process of being agreed) so as to not compromise the budget position. This is the recommended option.

- Item 2

A. The Council to undertake surveys and carry out a review of parking in this area prior to receiving survey data from the University. This would need to be added to next year's (2015/16) work programme. This is not the recommended option.

B. Continue to monitor this area in line with the ongoing surveys carried out by the University. The results would then be used to determine if a broader parking study is warranted and would allow discussions with the University as to funding or co-funding of a broader study. This is the recommended option because the survey is paid for externally and the additional data will allow a more informed view as to the need and benefits of a broader parking review.

## Analysis

8. The recommended Option 1C can be progressed via the Officer in Consultation process including dealing with any objections raised during the formal legal process. By tackling the issue in this manner

we are better able to respond to the concerns raised without adversely affecting the resources available for tackling these types of concern across the city annually.

9. The recommended Option 2B is an ongoing set of surveys being carried out as a consequence of the University development. The proposals that develop from these ongoing surveys could be adversely affected by individual actions taken resulting in financial commitments made that could have been covered by external funding. In addition a commitment to an additional comprehensive parking review here would lead to less resources being available elsewhere in the city.

### **Council Plan**

10. Considering this matter contributes to the Council Plan building strong communities by engaging with all members of the local community.

### **Implications**

11. **Financial** There are no financial implications

**Human Resources (HR)** There are no HR implications

**Equalities** There are no Equalities implications

**Legal** There are no Legal implications

**Crime and Disorder** (There are no Crime and Disorder implications)

**Information Technology (IT)** There are no IT implications

**Property** (There are no Property implications)

**Other** There are no other implications

### **Risk Management**

12. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

Alistair Briggs  
Traffic Management  
Tel No. 01904 551654

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

**Neil Ferris**  
**Assistant Director CES**

**Report**  
**Approved**



**Date**

18 March  
2015

**Wards Affected:** Heslington and Fulford

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers:** None

**Annexes**

Annex A – copy of front page of petition

